

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of this application. The FINAL Office Action, however, continued to reject all claims 1-14. Specifically, claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nguyen et al. (US 20030142333). Claims 1-5, 8 and 11-12 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Nakatsuji et al. (US 20010043214).

Claims 1-14 are canceled without prejudice, thereby rendering the outstanding rejections moot. Claims 15-24 have been added. Applicant submits that no new matter is added to the application by these new claims, as the new claims are fully supported by the original application.

### **Further Comments**

Although the outstanding rejections have been rendered moot, Applicant submits the following additional comments, with reference to the newly added claims.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference."

*Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Neither Nguyen nor Nakatsuji disclose all the features or limitations in the newly added claim 15 such that claim 15 should be allowed.

In this regard, the new independent claim 15 recites:

15. A disc editing method for a digital recording/playing device comprising:

***building a font recording space in a recordable optical disc that stores multi-media data;***

***pre-recording at least one font file in the font recording space, the font file comprising a plurality of font codes;***

inputting an inside code to specify a font code in the font file;  
***editing a name of the multi-media data with the inside  
code and the font file;***  
recording the inside code in the recordable optical disc;  
searching the font file for the font code mapping to the inside code;  
reading the searched find code; and  
***updating an on screen display (OSD) based on the font code.***

(*Emphasis added*). Independent claim 15 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

In comparison to the claimed embodiments, Nguyen does not teach or suggest what the Examiner relies upon it as supposedly teaching. In this regard, the Office Action asserts that Nguyen does disclose a readable and writable disc. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Although paragraph [0026] and [0027] of Nguyen discloses that instructions, programmed modules and data may be stored on a removable optical disc 31 via an optical disc drive 30, Nguyen does not disclose that a font recording space is built in a compact disc-recordable (CD-R) for recording the font file. It is noted that nowhere in the Nguyen reference does it disclose the font recording space is built in a recordable optical disc for recording the font file. Further, applicant cannot find any description disclosing Nguyen can edit the name of multi-media data stored on recordable optical disc with the font file and the inside code recorded thereon.

Comparing with Nguyen, Nguyen discloses that a translation of a glyph is operated by a glyph translation table (GTT) in paragraph [0043]. Nguyen also discloses that when the glyph is not supported, the glyph is regarded as a bitmap image to be printed. Nevertheless, Nguyen does not teach or suggest that the inside code and the font file pre-stored in the font recording space of the recordable optical disc are provided

for updating the on screen display (OSD) and for editing the name of multi-media data stored on the disc, either in specification or in figures.

Since Nguyen fails to teach or suggest all of the claimed features, new claim 15 is patentable over the cited reference. Insofar as claims 16-24 depend from claim 15, these claims are similarly patentable.

Nakatsuji does not teach or suggest all of characteristics in the new claim 15, either. In Claim 15, the name of multi-media data stored on the optical disc is edited with the recorded font file and inside code. In Nakatsuji, however, the bar code font file recorded on a recording medium is provided to the OS 30 for printing (see paragraph [0052] and Fig. 2). It is respectfully submitted that Nakatsuji fails to teach or suggest the limitation of claim 15 emphasized above.

The teaching of Nakatsuji is directed to a bar code recording and printing system for converting the bar code into other bard code font to be printed (See paragraph [0048] and Fig. 4). Also, Nakatsuji uses the bar code font file recorded on the recording medium for eliminating the need for adding any function for printing (see paragraph [0052] and Fig. 2).

However, Nakatsuji neither teaches that updating the on screen display (OSD) based on the font code pre-stored on recordable optical disc, nor reasonably suggests that editing the name of multi-media data stored on the optical disc with the font file and the inside code pre-stored thereon, as recited in the new claim 15.

For at least this reason, claim 15 patently defines over the cited art. Since Nakatsuji does not disclose all the limitations of the new independent claim 15, dependent claims 16-24 are similarly patentable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of the application and the timely allowance of claims.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

A credit card authorization is provided to cover the fee associated with the accompanying RCE application. No additional fee is believed to be due in connection with this submission. If, however, any additional fee is believed to be due, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

---

**Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962**

**THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**  
Suite 1500  
600 Galleria Parkway S.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(770) 933-9500